

Seraphim
Cherubini
Cherub
Pharaoh
Ecclesiastical
Hare Krishna
Qur'an
Judas Iscariot
Nebuchadnezzar
Judaism
Nazarene
Canaanite Baal
Melchizedek a Levitical
carnivorous
Goldilocks Zone
Tsar
hypocrisy
Pinocchio
Pontius Pilate
Sejanus
Caiaphas
metamorphism
Jehovah
Carthaginian

289

These legal arguments cover the following topics: intermediate force capabilities, directed energy, anomalous health incidents, pulsed microwave attacks, millimeter wave, Active Denial, DEWs, electronic harassment, white torture, no-touch torture, rabbit (targeted person), intelligence contractor, FBI Terrorist Disruption, Weaponized DoJ, Department of Defense, targeted individual.

Allegation: Stephen Watson alleges that he and a targeted family member have and still are being physically abused by those in authority, most likely law enforcement or a 'Technology Exploration and Development Program' using intermediate force capabilities like non lethal directed energy weapons developed by the National Institute of Justice along with weapon defense contractors like Raytheon and or Lockheed Martin. Such abusive behavior by the authorities lacks public oversight and is part of counterterrorism bureaucracies where such nefarious activity is kept secret most likely also involving 'threat mitigation' intelligence contractors. I.e Palantir, Leidos etc. who've been linked with law enforcement in terrorism screening. Stephen Watson believes what made him a target or put on a 'terrorist watch list' was researching UFOs or conducting open source

research that was well within his first amendment rights. His abuse coincided with internet activity like posting to UFO forums that points to surveillance powers and possibly the Pentagon who had the "Advanced Aerial Threat (AATIP)" program unbeknown to the public or Stephen Watson until recently with leaked documents and congressional inquiries into the subject matter. Stephen Watson believes the government 'alarmism' over UFOs or UAP amounts to a wild goose chase and may be more about space force/defense spending. This alarmism has infringed on his civil liberties and justified ongoing human rights abuses. Stephen Watson believes draconian measures enacted after 9-11-01 instead of protecting America from terrorist have hurt America violating the US constitution, eroding privacy, and creating a militarized police state or despotism. Coupled with the 'fact' that the risk of the average person being affected by a terrorist attack or a terrorist attack on the scale of 9-11-01 is extremely low. The war on terrorism appears to be a political tool and politicians unwillingness to scale back counterterrorism spending has more to do about money they've become reliant on receiving contributing to the national deficit.

Arguments Against my Watch-Listing and Targeting

The 'Making A Mountain Over A Molehill' Argument: Stephen Watson's interest in UFOs was part of the 'Spirit of Inquiry.' A person should not be punished by natural curiosity conducting open-source research or researching using publicly available information. A person should not be punished or retaliated against for making discoveries on their own using material available to anyone like making an ionocraft 'Lifter.' What the person discovered could have been discovered or seen by anyone else, including adversaries since the source is not classified in nature. The government retaliating in this case by stalking, harassing (using intermediate force capabilities (IFC) or what the FBI calls a 'terrorist disruption'), terrorist watch-listing would be considered overzealous by 'making a mountain over a molehill' and a waste of tax dollars on non-threats. It also points to too much secrecy if information that upsets the government or Pentagon about UFOs can already be seen by a curious public kept secret. If it is implied Stephen Watson had special skills or ability to discover information sensitive in nature from a public source this would be a misnomer. Stephen Watson's research ability 'looking at UFO details from reports' was simplistic in nature and required no special skill or natural ability. His father who experiments making ion lifters does not process a high amount of education, many of his UFO sketches are only 'theoretical' and not scientifically peer reviewed, his father also makes 'pseudo-science' or 'supernatural' claims.

Summary: Stephen Watson believes that he has been watch-listed for questionable reasons like UFO research and that the government has no real case against him since he was only exercising his First Amendment Constitutional right. It has been established that the DoJ-FBI has made

mounds over mow hills, accused of entrapping people, becoming weaponized and politicized, and even creating the very terrorist plots they bust. It has also been established that government has alarmist tendencies like the UAP hearings that gave no clear answers about UFOs to the public. One can interpret these alarmist tenancies as a motivation of increased government spending rather than serve the public interest. Those who terrorist watch-listed him may argue it's because he is anti-American. Stephen Watson would counter argue he was anti-cover up after hearing Steven Greer of the Disclosure Project on Art Bell in the early 2000s. Stephen Watson believes that people have a fundamental right to know the true nature of our universe and other life that may exist and or technology breakthroughs that may help mankind. A whistle blower at the congressional UAP hearing asserted similar cover-up claims. As far as Stephen Watson's father who he reconnected with in 2013. Stephen Watson's targeting from researching UFOs began before contacting his father. Stephen Watson's Dad is into ion lifters or ionocraft. Much of his father's ideas on UFOs or rocket propulsion that Stephen Watson detailed in self-published books have not been scientifically peer reviewed and could only be considered theoretical in nature. His father's electrical experiments piddling with salvaged junk are of his own discovery and scientific curiosity that is reflect in the Spirit of Inquiry. Stephen Watson's father also does not have any specialized equipment, aerospace materials, meta materials and his father states that even Nikola Tesla who experimented with electricity over 100 years ago could have made a similar discovery such as the aerial tele-automaton described in a 1918 article. It's more likely the Pentagon or government is overreacting to Stephen Watson's UFO research efforts and have too much secrecy that should have already been declassified since any other country could have made similar discoveries to his dad piddling with salvaged junk and electricity and made similar UFO observations by gathering reports looking at open source (OSNIT) information. Stephen Watson also states that his UFO research was never a secret and never sent exclusively to a foreign government nor has he been contacted by foreign agents. Stephen Watson has little scope and understanding of aerospace engineering and does not have a scientific background and would be very little use to a foreign power. Stephen Watson tried promoting his father's ionocraft concepts and UFO theories to American companies like Lockheed Martin, Bell Helicopter, even NASA years ago around a decade ago before the tic-tac UAP leaked footage or UAP congressional hearings but only received rejection letters. His father has also made pseudoscientific claims like believing in angels or ancient lore he sees on an Italian TV channel called Focus. Stephen Watson believes the arguments he has put forward would hold up in court and sway a jury over any government argument that he posed a threat to national security. The governments argument that Stephen Watson is a threat and should be put on a terrorist watch-list is silly. It would be like arguing someone who read UFO books and at the library and Googled about UFOs is a threat to national security when there was no access or compromise of classified documents.

Arguments about being targeted over internet trolling.

Argument: internet trolling is frowned upon but is still protected by free speech and remedied by a moderator requiring no government intervention or the use of intermediate force capabilities; pain compliance methods which would be considered excessive ‘weaponized form of government’; a form of high-tech oppression violating the US Constitution; and a waste of tax dollars since it requires no government or law enforcement intervention.

Argument: A person being unpopular on the internet or considered a ‘loner’ does not give the government, or surveillance powers a right to use that person for human experimentation, justify cruel and unusual punishment, or put the unpopular person on watch-list if there is no evidence or terrorism. This would be considered opportunistic; overzealous behavior by government and an abuse of power.

Although internet trolling is a frowned upon social behavior on the internet it is nevertheless how some introverts or asocial people express themselves by getting a rise out of an online community’s reaction or being provocative. Stephen Watson’s past trolling behavior did not break any laws, nor was it by a Russian troll factory designed to manipulate groups of people for political purposes. It was not cyber-criminal behavior like internet hacking into networks or social engineering for identify theft. Stephen Watson also does not participate on the dark web. Stephen Watson argues that much of his trolling during the Web 1.0 and Web 2.0 years from the late 1990s to the early 2000s was quickly remedied by internet moderating. Sometimes Stephen Watson was banned for being unpopular or opinionated and that would also not be considered a crime. Stephen Watson is not affiliated with online hate groups. Anything offensive he has posted in the past was only to provoke a response. If the authorities claim Stephen Watson’s trolling behavior could be precursor to terrorist activity and proactive policing needs to be involved this would be a weak argument since literally millions of online users are guilty of trolling from time to time, even public figures. Ignoring the troll or internet moderation has been an effective remedy to trolling requiring very little involvement by the government or law enforcement.

Legal and Philosophical Arguments Against Electronic Warfare Targeting

Argument: Any reasonable citizen would consider two decades of physical abuse excessive in nature; more about R&D than protection.

Stephen Watson was targeted with directed energy over a span of two decades. A targeted family member, his mother, who is a senior citizen was targeted over a decade. It’s hard to argue such targeting was not abusive in

nature and was necessary. It is more likely that he was targeted because he was vulnerable for abuse and the abusers wanted someone to test, R&D their electronic warfare (EW) intermediate force (IFC) weapons against.

Argument: The Government is not God; The targeting lacks due process; public approval. Therefore such activity can be considered 'foul play' and the government is in the wrong even if 'contractors' are involved.

Any punishment against a citizen that causes pain, suffering, or loss of liberty should be handed down by a judge and or a jury after all the evidence is weighed and there is due process. Those in government or positions of power are not God. Their actions inflicting punishment out of the public eye can be viewed as vigilante. It can also be viewed as a cowardly act since those using electronic warfare against citizens have a clear weapons advantage inflicting pain remotely where there is little recourse or ability for the victims to defend themself.

Argument: Counterterrorism programs have created a climate of abusive power due to a lack of public oversight. This is an overreach in power that is 'self-serving' to those involved (I.e. money to contractors; continued money to programs) and does not serve the public interest at large.

Counterterrorism and other draconian measures such as terrorist watch-listing does not give the US Government, Federal Government, Law Enforcement, the DoD or Defense-Intelligence Contractors the right to do what they want against a citizen like torture, white (no-touch) torture, or cruel human experimentation. How can the you criticize other countries human rights record if you commit heinous actions against your own people as a means of punishment or oppression? This goes against the foundation of who we are as free and democratic society. i.e. life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Cruel oppression only makes people less free, afraid to speak up, or exercise their right to protest. A practice used by tyrannical rulers or the lesser developed world.

Argument: The government's ability to have an extreme stealth weapon advantage over citizens like a ray gun that inflicts intense pain for torment opens up too much room for abuse. Many citizens would be against such 'ray gun' weaponry being used coupled with already draconian surveillance where privacy has been eroded.

Electronic Warfare (EW) waged against vulnerable targeted people using Intermediate Force Capabilities (IFC) like directed energy (DE) would not pass the smell test if disclosed to the public at large. Any reasonable person would consider such behavior overbearing and abusive in nature. This would also alarm those who believe in a right to bear arms as a defense against tyrannical rule.

Argument: The nature of punishment in this case stealth weapons being used against watch-listed or selectively targeted citizens as part of 'intermediate force' seems disproportionate to those who may have committed more serious offenses in the public's eye. Any reasonable person would consider such actions 'unfair' since certain citizens are being treated more harshly than others. We're all fallible so such behavior inflicting punishment more harshly to some than others would be considered 'unjust.'

Some people may assume that a targeted individual deserves their treatment and are somehow bad people but in truth we're all fallible and not perfect and should be allowed the same due process as anyone else

Argument: Liability protections should be waved or 'piercing the corporate veil' in the case of veteran own threat mitigation contractors when basic human rights are being violated or there is extreme abuse 'cruel and unusual punishment.' This goes back to the argument the government or affiliated agencies, law enforcement, parties like contractors is not God.

People part of targeting programs, including politicians, or Federal powers have liability protections (to protect from civil actions).

The 'not a threat' Argument: Stephen Watson believes his targeting represents government alarmism and an infringement of his civil liberties. His internet activity could be considered insignificant garnishing very little interest from the public and from information anyone could have viewed. Natural curiosity should not be punishable and part of the 'Spirit of Inquiry.' Furthermore Stephen Watson and his father who had his own theories about UFOs and makes ion lifters do not possess a great deal of scientific, aerospace, or mechanical engineering education. His research has not received interest by domestic or foreign powers just as he's never been privy to classified information having no military background or security clearance. Therefore any reasonable person part of jury could conclude his on-going harassment and watch-listing status is a form of abusive power that is 'grasping at straws. The FBI would embarrass itself and loose in court arguing he was a threat to national security. The FBI would also have a hard time convincing a jury that Stephen Watson has any affiliation to criminal or terrorist activities.

Stephen Watson observed his targeting coincided to posting to the internet and researching UFOs from open source information before it was revealed the Pentagon had a UAP threat identification program. Even after public hearings the government, so called whistle blowers, and experts have provided no real answers or unsubstantiated claims. The public did not demand an investigation into UFOs or UAP nor have they been captivated by the proceedings. Such proceedings a bureaucracy created to investigate UAP

could be considered a wild goose chase or an overreaction to emerging powers like China.

The 'Witch Hunt' argument: The term weaponized government and politicized FBI, Justice Department has been prevalent in the news. Stephen Watson argues his own targeting is a reflection of government witch-hunt behavior and that his own civil liberties and privacy has been violated by those abusing surveillance powers. The motivation is driven by spending than any real viable threat that he poses to the country. His targeting represents wasteful spending that should have been directed elsewhere as evident in the countries decline. Government witch-hunt behavior undermines people's faith in government 'a fair and just system' and law enforcement. It reflects corruption typical of the lesser-developed world.

The 'Perps Lack Intelligence' Argument. Stephen Watson argues that anyone who justifies torture or physical abuse (like using intermediate force capabilities) lacks intelligence. Law enforcement may mean well in their action but also lack a high degree of education in the Liberal Arts or humanities. Any reasonable person could see how stealthy weapons like directed energy intermediate force or non-lethal weapons and surveillance capabilities can be abused by those in law enforcement or those who's highest level of education may have been the military.